Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 29 1994
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

(2)

No. 93-1402

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1993

WALTER P. SOLICK,

Petitioner,

v.

PARIS ACCESSORIES, INC.,

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Third Circuit

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

MARTIN J. SOBOL*
STEVEN K. LUDWIG

FOX, ROTHSCHILD, O'BRIEN & FRANKEL
2000 Market Street, Tenth Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3291
(215) 299-2000
Attorneys for Respondent, Paris Accessories, Inc.

*Counsel of Record

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

4 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether a discharged employee failed to meet the burden of demonstrating that equitable tolling of the statute of limitations was warranted where his subsequently disbarred attorney failed to file a timely charge of discrimination?

II. Whether unrebutted evidence demonstrated that notices required by the Age Discrimination in Employment Act were properly posted in the workplace?

LIST OF PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner Walter P. Solick ("Solick") is an individual resident of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Respondent Paris Accessories, Inc. is a corporation with no parent companies and no subsidiaries.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE WRIT

Respondent Paris Accessories, Inc. respectfully requests that this Court deny the petition for writ of certiorari seeking review of the Third Circuit's memorandum opinion which is not published.

Solick asserts that certiorari is appropriate because a federal court of appeals purportedly has rendered a decision in conflict with the decision of another federal court of appeals. Solick has not identified *any* decision which conflicts with the Third Circuit's decision. The Third Circuit and the district court thoroughly considered the applicable precedent and applied settled law governing equitable tolling to undisputed facts.

CONCLUSION

Because there is no reason for the Court to grant certiorari in this case, the petition for writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN J. SOBOL*
STEVEN K. LUDWIG

FOX, ROTHSCHILD, O'BRIEN & FRANKEL
2000 Market Street, Tenth Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103-3291
(215) 299-2000
Attorneys for Respondent, Paris Accessories, Inc.

*Counsel of Record

March 1994